



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

of self-control up to the point where self-suppression seemed more heroic and noble than self-realization. On the other hand, the doctrine of a personal immortality, proclaimed not only by Christianity but by numerous mysteries and other cult-communities, had created an otherworldliness that counted the conditions and experiences of this life as of little importance. It is well worth observing how wisely, in the historic circumstances, the growing Catholic Church, directed by the sturdy practical sense of Rome, steered the middle course between the extremes, saving the sanctity of the institution of marriage, while retaining in the case of its spiritual ministry the idea of a superior sanctity attaching to celibacy.

There is a tender mysticism in these works, nourished by the cult and by the memories of the holy apostles who not only embodied in their characters the Christian ideal, but transcended the bounds of what was attainable by others in their power of working miracles. The piety is so sincere, the devotion so genuine, the faith so simple and often sweetly expressed, and yet the tales are so manifestly fictitious, without the slightest foundation in fact, that they should be especially valuable to those who still find it difficult to understand how religious romances can be woven out of such material as faith works with by earnest men, willing to give up for the cause they have espoused, not only the ordinary joys of life, but life itself. These authors were Gnostics,—their docetic conception of the Christ and their encratism prove that; but when they wrote, the church in all its parts was so much under the influence of this Gnostic movement that their stories of the apostles continued to be popular reading. It is generally supposed that they have undergone certain mutilations at the hands of orthodox copyists. This is evident from the description given by Photius; but one cannot help asking why they did not remove all the traces of heresy.

NATHANIEL SCHMIDT.

Cornell University.

THE REPUBLICAN TRADITION IN EUROPE. By H. A. L. Fisher, M.A. London: Methuen & Co., 1911. Pp. xi, 305.

Written by an accomplished historian, with historical and not with any apparent doctrinal purpose, this book (based on lectures to an American audience) has for me the interest of

confirming a position I have been accustomed to maintain with some consciousness of antagonism to those who, in the last century, claimed especially to represent 'the historical sense.' Much used to be made of the supposed absurdity, in the mouths of French Revolutionaries, of the appeal to Brutus and Cassius, and other ancient republicans and tyrannicides, as precedents for their own cause. Brutus and Cassius, it was pointed out, were 'aristocrats'; that is to say, they were describable by the most vituperative term in the vocabulary of those who were founding the new democratic republic. Now Mr. Fisher makes perfectly clear the distinctive features of modern democratic republicanism. He shows how, though it grew up never wholly untouched by classical influences, it always had its direct origin in practical grievances; how, both in America and in France, there was something undesigned in the process that ended in the foundation of a great national Republic,—a state of a new order as compared with any ancient or mediæval city-republic. Yet he leaves no doubt from beginning to end that there was a sound basis for the conception of the republican cause as one. The differences of aristocratic and democratic, federal and unitary, and so forth, are differences within one type, broadly contrasted with the theocratic monarchy that descends in Europe from Cæsar and Constantine. The remote origin of this as of the classical republics he does not follow out; but, opening with a brief sketch of the ideal of European monarchy, as impressively stated by Bossuet, he begins his account of the republican tradition with the revivals of classical republicanism, at first very slight, in the Middle Ages, and arrives soon at the rise of the French Republic; from whence onwards the tradition of European monarchy, though still strong and perhaps even predominant, has been confronted with a definitely republican doctrine.

The European movement, it thus appears from the history, has a sort of cyclical character. From the fall of the Roman Republic to the revived knowledge of earlier antiquity at the dawn of the modern epoch, the tradition of Europe has been mainly monarchical. "The interest in the history of republican Rome dates from the Renaissance." Near the middle of the seventeenth century, it seemed as if absolute monarchy was to be finally triumphant; but then came the English Civil War, to be followed after a period of repose by the American War

of Independence and the French Revolution; and now Western Europe and America are divided among republics and (more or less) constitutional monarchies. Political freedom, over a certain range, is held to be secure. And the logical community between the republican ideal within the state in ancient and in modern times is not denied. Yet to this logic the author, in a way that to some will seem characteristically English, refuses to yield. The movement that has gone so far is to go no further. We are now to substitute constitutional monarchy as the real terminus of progress. "The republican movement has done its work."

With this last position, especially in view of recent events in Portugal (before the appearance of W. Fisher's book) and in the Far East (since it appeared), I am unable to agree. Of the two forms, he seems to think, hereditary monarchy of the constitutional type is preferable on its merits to formal republicanism; and he does not definitely point out that a constitutional monarchy, according to the defense of it that was almost official in England, is really a kind of republic with a hereditary head. This shows the disadvantages of preserving, for the sake of continuity, an old form of which we repudiate the inner meaning. It may be said with truth that for more than two centuries no other course has been possible; but, merely as a matter of imaginative preference, Liberals at least might have continued to lay all the stress on the idea of Commonwealth, and not assumed, or perhaps sincerely tried to share, an admiration of monarchical institutions for themselves. These last remarks do not apply to the author, who, I cannot help thinking, has been unable, in a realistic statement of the present causes of the revival of monarchical feeling, to repress a touch of sarcasm in his way of putting it. He fully recognizes that the emotional appeal of modern republicanism, in spite of the baser elements that mix themselves with all human ideals when they reach the stage of action, has been to the nobler feelings. And this is what he says on the revival of monarchical feeling in England: "Physical science, which, by planing down social and intellectual inequalities, has given us a democratic civilization, supplies, by a subtle form of revenge, to persons of eminent station, a powerful engine of advertisement and a kind of automatic mechanism for the manufacture of popularity." Then follows an account of the rôle

of photography, the cinematograph, steam, and electricity, in enabling "the most remote person of all, the head of the State, to take lodgment in the feeblest and humblest imagination." "Thus by a process of ceaseless and multitudinous attrition the image of the sovereign and his circle is stamped into the brain-stuff of the country" (pp. 272, 273). It would have been a pleasure to transcribe the whole passage; but I prefer to send the reader to the book itself. I merely set beside it, as not inapposite, a reference from another page (p. 146) to the Miltonic republicanism of Walter Savage Landor: "To Landor's mind a monarchy seemed inherently vulgar."

As to the prospects for the future, I think not quite enough stress is laid on a certain logical coherence of the two most strongly opposed types,—the formal Republic and theocratic Absolutism; though certainly the author is clear enough on the historic necessity with which republicanism in the Latin countries has become anti-clerical. And for the past a real practical efficacy in logic is recognized. Some of the causes of the triumph in France of the republican principle, it is remarked (p. 62), "belong to the intellectual tissue of the age." Thus while few either among thinkers or practical reformers had advocated a republic in advance, republican institutions came, when once the movement was set going, through a certain compulsive force that there is finally in logic. It may be important to bear this in mind. Whenever our country again has an impassioned mood, the theoretic positions in terms of which political thinking has gone on will not be negligible.

T. WHITTAKER.

London, England.

THE PSYCHOLOGY OF EDUCATION. By J. Welton, M.A., Professor of Education in the University of Leeds. London: Macmillan & Co., 1911. Pp. xxi, 507.

In the words of Professor Welton's preface: "This book is a systematic treatise neither on psychology nor on education. It endeavors to set forth the relation between them." This relation he says "must be found in the actual lives of individual children," and his object is to help people engaged in education to study those lives and, it may be, to inspire teachers "to publish precise records of careful observation on points